

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 05-1711

KESS TANI,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

SALOMON BROTHERS REALTY CORPORATION/CITIGROUP,
President and CEO; BRUCE WILLIAMS, President
and CEO, C-Bass; FRIEDMAN AND MACFAYDEN, Law
Firm; ALVIN E. FRIEDMAN, P.A., Trustee;
KENNETH J. MACFAYDEN; DANIEL MENCHEL, Trustee;
JAMES J. LOFTUS, Trustee; MICHAEL T. CANTRELL,
Partner, Law Firm of Friedman & MacFayden,

Defendants - Appellees.

and

DEBRA LYMAN, Assistant Vice President, Salomon
Brothers Realty Corporation/CitiGroup; LARRY
LITTON, President and CEO, Litton Loan
Servicing, LP; LELA DEROUEN, Assistant Vice
President, Litton Loan Servicing, LP; STEVE
DRODDY, Mortgage Analyst, Litton Loan
Servicing, LP,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Baltimore. Catherine C. Blake, District Judge. (CA-
03-2566-CCB)

Submitted: November 22, 2005

Decided: December 1, 2005

Before MOTZ, TRAXLER, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Kess Tani, Appellant Pro Se. Kenneth John MacFayden, Michael Thomas Cantrell, FRIEDMAN & MACFAYDEN, PC, Baltimore, Maryland; Jeffrey Barry Fisher, Traci Y. Gray, GIORDANO, BUSH, VILLAREALE & VAUGHAN, PA, Upper Marlboro, Maryland; Martin Stuart Goldberg, THE FISHER LAW GROUP, Upper Marlboro, Maryland; Gregg Edward Viola, ECCLESTON & WOLF, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Kess Tani appeals from the district court's orders granting summary judgment in favor of Defendants in his action in which he asserted violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act and other claims arising from the Defendants' initiation of foreclosure proceedings. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinions and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Tani v. Lyman, No. CA-03-2566-CCB (D. Md. Nov. 29, 2004; filed Mar. 2, 2005 & entered Mar. 3, 2005; May 31, 2005). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED